arXiv:1610.01650v1 [math.LO] 5 Oct 2016

INDEX SETS OF UNIVERSAL CODES

ACHILLES A. BEROS AND KONSTANTINOS A. BEROS

Abstract. We examine sets of codes such that certain properties are invariant under the choice of oracle from a range of possible oracles and establish a connection between such codes and Medvedev reductions. In examing the complexity of such sets of *universal codes*, we prove completeness results at various levels of the arithmetic hierarchy as well as two general theorems for obtaining Π^1_1-completeness for sets of universal codes. Among other corollaries, we show that the set of codes for Medvedev reductions of bi-immune sets to DNC functions is Π^1_1-complete.

1. Introduction

Throughout, we will use the notation $\{e\}^A(x)$ for the result of applying the Turing machine coded by e, with oracle A, to input x. If the attempt to compute $\{e\}^A(x)$ halts and gives output $y \in \mathbb{N}$, we write

$$\{e\}^A(x) \downarrow = y.$$

Otherwise, we write $\{e\}^A(x) \uparrow$ to indicate that the computation of $\{e\}^A(x)$ never terminates. Note the the oracle A may be either a subset of $\mathbb{N}$ or a (possibly partial) function on $\mathbb{N}$. In the event that A is a partial function, we require $\{e\}^A(x)$ to diverge if an oracle query is made for an input not in the domain of A.

We let $\{e\}^A_s(x)$ denote the result of allowing the computation of $\{e\}^A(x)$ to run for s computation stages. Finally, use$(\{e\}^A_s(x))$ will denote the largest oracle query made by the computations $\{e\}^A_{s'}$, for $s' \leq s$.

Recall that, for sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, one says A is *Turing reducible* to B (denoted $A \leq_{\mathrm{T}} B$) if, and only if, there is an $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the computation of $\{e\}^A(x)$ terminates with output 0 or 1, for each $x \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$(\forall x)(x \in A \iff \{e\}^B(x) \downarrow = 1).$$

In this case, we write $\{e\}^B = \chi_A$ to indicate that the map

$$x \mapsto \{e\}^B(x)$$

is the characteristic function of A. Sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ are said to be *Turing equivalent* (written $A \equiv_{\mathrm{T}} B$) if, and only if, $A \leq_{\mathrm{T}} B$ and $B \leq_{\mathrm{T}} A$. The *Turing degree* of $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is the family $\{B \subseteq \mathbb{N} : B \equiv_{\mathrm{T}} A\}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.

The relation of Turing reducibility gives a natural pre-order on the family of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. With this in mind, it is desirable to have a corresponding pre-order on the subsets of the Turing degrees themselves. There are several natural ways of obtaining such a pre-order. Extensive study has been done of two such pre-orders: *Muchnik reducibility* and *Medvedev reducibility*.

Definition 1.1. [5][6] Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be sets of degrees.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03D30, 03D80.

(1) $\mathcal{A}$ is *Muchnik reducible* (or *weakly reducible*) to $\mathcal{B}$ (written $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$) if

$$(\forall B \in \mathcal{B})(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})(\exists e \in \mathbb{N})\Big(\{e\}^B = \chi_A\Big)$$

(2) $\mathcal{A}$ is *Medvedev reducible* (or *strongly reducible*) to $\mathcal{B}$ (written $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$) if

$$(\exists e \in \mathbb{N})(\forall B \in \mathcal{B})(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})\Big(\{e\}^B = \chi_A\Big)$$

The oracle Turing machine determined by e as above is called a Muchnik (resp., Medvedev) reduction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.

In the case that $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$, with e such that

$$(\forall B \in \mathcal{B})(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})\Big(\{e\}^B = \chi_A\Big),$$

we call e a *code* witnessing the Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$. In the present work, we study the arithmetic complexity of sets of codes of Medvedev reductions associated to various classes $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. We make the following definition.

Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be families of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. We say that $e \in \mathbb{N}$ is a *$\mathcal{B}$-universal $\mathcal{A}$-code* if

$$(\forall B \in \mathcal{B})(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})\big(\{e\}^B = \chi_A\big).$$

We let $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$ denote the set of all $\mathcal{B}$-universal $\mathcal{A}$-codes.

By definition, a $\mathcal{B}$-universal $\mathcal{A}$-code determines a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$ corrresponds to the set of Medvedev reductions of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.

As a more general case of this definition, we suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are classes of partial functions instead of oracles. Consider the following:

Definition 1.3. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are families of (possibly partial) functions on $\mathbb{N}$. We say that $e \in \mathbb{N}$ is a *$\mathcal{G}$-universal $\mathcal{F}$-code* if, and only if, the function

$$x \mapsto \{e\}^g(x)$$

is in $\mathcal{F}$, for each $g \in \mathcal{G}$. As before, we let $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$ denote the set of $\mathcal{G}$-universal $\mathcal{F}$-codes.

Definition 1.2 may be regarded as a special case of Definition 1.3 by letting $\mathcal{F}$ (in Definition 1.3) be the class of characteristic functions of the sets in the degrees from the class $\mathcal{A}$ (in Definition 1.2) and $\mathcal{G}$ be the class of characteristic functions of the sets in $\mathcal{B}$.

We will also combine the two definitions in certain case, e.g., we will consider index sets of the form $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{A}]$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of sets and $\mathcal{G}$ is a family of functions.

Definition 1.3 also reveals the reason for the choice of the terminology "$\mathcal{G}$-universal $\mathcal{F}$-code": if $e \in \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$, then $\{e\}^g$ codes a function in $\mathcal{F}$, regardless of the choice of oracle $g \in \mathcal{G}$. The set $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$ is therefore the set of codes, e, such that the behavior of the oracle machine coded by e is invariant (in the sense that it is always in $\mathcal{F}$) under the choice of oracle $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

In what follows, we make use of both Definitions 1.2 and 1.3. It will always be clear from context which one applies.

There are obvious codes in $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$, for many choices of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. For instance, if TOT denotes the family of total functions, a code for a total function which makes no oracle queries will be in the class $\mathcal{G}[\text{TOT}]$, for any choice of $\mathcal{G}$. Naturally, it is of interest when there are nontrivial elements of $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$. In this case, we give "nontriviality" a precise meaning with the following definition.

Definition 1.4. We say that a $\mathcal{G}$-universal $\mathcal{F}$-code e is *non-trivial* if there are $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\{e\}^{g_0} \neq \{e\}^{g_1}$ and *strongly non-trivial* if for all $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{G}$, $\{e\}^{g_0} \neq \{e\}^{g_1}$.

The nontrivial elements of $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$ are, therefore, the codes which do not simply ignore the oracle $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

In many case, the structure of the class $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$ can be quite complex. In the present work, we quantify this by establishing the complexity of the $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}]$ for various classes $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. In several cases these index sets are arithmetic, but, in more than one instance, they are beyond hyperarithmetic.

Letting INF denote the family of infinite c.e. sets and TOT the family of total computable functions, we have the following arithmetic complexity result.

Proposition 1.5. *The index set* INF[TOT] *is* Π^0_3*-complete.*

Similarly, letting FIN denote the set of partial computable functions with finite domain, we have

Proposition 1.6. *If* $\mathcal{F}$ *is any uniformly computable family of sets,* $\mathcal{F}$[FIN] *has a strongly non-trivial element and is* Π^0_3*-complete.*

Before stating our main result, we recall a couple of standard definitions. A total function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is *diagonally non-computable* (abbreviated, *dnc*) if, and only if, for each $e \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\{e\}(e)\downarrow = y \implies f(e) \neq y.$$

We let DNC denote the family of dnc functions. A set, $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, is *immune* if it contains no infinite c.e. set, and *bi-immune* if both A and $\overline{A}$ are immune. Let BI denote the family of bi-immune sets. Finally, recall that a set $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is Π^1_1 if it is many-one reducible to the set of Turing codes for characteristic functions of recursive trees in $\mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$, which have no infinite branches.

It is known that there is a Medvedev reduction of DNC to BI [3]. In fact, the corresponding set of codes is as complicated as possible:

Theorem 1.7. DNC[BI] *is* Π^1_1*-complete.*

(Note that, if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are hyperarithmetic, then $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$ is at most Π^1_1.)

This latter result is a consequence of a more general theorem which, informally, states that, if ω^ω may be "effectively" embedded into a hyperarithmetic class, $\mathcal{A}$, and $\mathcal{B}$ is a hyperarithmetic tail set, Medvedev reducible to $\mathcal{A}$, then the index set $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$ is always Π^1_1-complete.

2. Basic facts and notation

The next Proposition makes explicit the connection between universal codes and Medvedev reductions.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ *and* $\mathcal{B}$ *is a family of (possibly partial) functions on* ω*.* $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}] \neq \emptyset$*. Furthermore,* $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$ *is the set of codes for reductions witnessing* $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$*.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are as in the statement and $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}] \neq \emptyset$. If $e \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$, then for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, not only is $A = \{e\}^B \in \mathcal{A}$ c.e. in B, but it is computable from B. Thus, e codes a turing functional that uniformly computes elements of $\mathcal{A}$ from elements

of $\mathcal{B}$ – in other words, it is a Medvedev reduction. Conversely, if $\Psi(\sigma, x) = \{e\}^\sigma(x)$ witnesses $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$, then for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\Psi(B)$ is total and hence computable in B. □

In light of this theorem, we will begin our investigation of universal codes by examining the complexity of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{A}]$ for some classes where it is known or trivial to see that $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 2.2. *The index set* INF[TOT] *is* Π^0_3*-complete.*

Proof. First of all, to see that INF[TOT] is Π^0_3, observe that

$$e \in \text{INF}[\text{TOT}] \iff (\forall a, n)(a \in \text{FIN} \vee (\exists s)(\forall t \geq s)(\{e\}_t^{W_{a,t}}(n)\downarrow)).$$

Next, to see that INF[TOT] is Π^0_3-hard, let B be a fixed Π^0_3 set, with $g : \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ a total computable function such that

$$x \in B \iff (\forall y)(g(x, y) \in \text{FIN}),$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

For an infinite set A, let $C^*_n(A)$ denote the set of i such that i is the $\langle n, k\rangle$-th element of A, for some k. If A is infinite, note that each $C^*_n(A)$ is also infinite. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a total computable function such that, for each $e \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\{f(e)\}^A(n)\downarrow \iff (\exists m \in C^*_n(A))(W_{g(e,n),m+1} = W_{g(e,n),m}).$$

In the first place, if $e \in B$, then $g(e, n) \in$ FIN, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\{f(e)\}^A(n)\downarrow$, for each n, since A is infinite and $W_{g(e,n),m+1} = W_{g(e,n),m}$, for all but finitely many m.

On the other hand, if $e \notin B$, then there exists n such that $W_{g(e,n)}$ is infinite. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be an infinite c.e. set such that

$$C^*_n(A) \subseteq \{m : W_{e,m+1} \neq W_{e,m}\}.$$

It follows that $\{f(e)\}^A(n)$ never converges, since there is no $m = C^*_n(A)$ such that $W_{e,m+1} = W_{e,m}$. In other words, $f(e) \notin$ INF[TOT]. □

Proposition 2.3. *If* $\mathcal{F}$ *is any uniformly computable family,* $\mathcal{F}$[FIN] *has a strongly non-trivial element and is* Π^0_3*-complete.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_0, F_1, \ldots\}$ be a uniformly computable family. Let p be a computable function such that $p(\sigma) = i$ if $i < |\sigma|$ is least such that $\sigma = F_i\restriction|\sigma|$ and $p(\sigma) = -1$ if there is no such i. Define a code e such that

$$\{e\}^A(x) = \begin{cases} p(A\restriction x) & \text{if } p(A\restriction x) \neq p(A\restriction(x-1) \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\{e\}^A$ has finite domain and if $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ with $A \neq B$, then $\{e\}^A \neq \{e\}^B$.

We now prove that $\mathcal{F}$[FIN] is Π^0_3-complete. To see that $\mathcal{F}$[FIN] is Π^0_3, observe that

$$\mathcal{F}[\text{FIN}] = \Big\{e : (\forall i)(\exists b)(\forall x > b, s)\big(\{e\}_s^{F_i}(x)\uparrow\big)\Big\}.$$

We use a movable markers argument to prove hardness. Let $f : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \{0, 1\}$ be a computable function such that $f_i(x) = f(i, x)$ is the characteristic function of F_i. Define a computable function g such that $g(e, n, s) = y$ if and only if y is the n^{th} element of $\overline{W}_{e,s}$. Define a computable function h such that $\{h(e)\}^\sigma(x)\downarrow = 1$ if

(1) $|\sigma| \geq x$ and
(2) if i is least such that $\sigma\restriction x = f_i\restriction x$, then there is an $s > x$ such that $g(e,i,s) \neq g(e,i,x)$.

If $e \in \text{COF}$, then for all $i > \max(\overline{W}_e)$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $y > x$ such that $g(e,i,y) \neq g(e,i,x)$. Thus, for all $i > \max(\overline{W}_e)$, $\{h(e)\}^{F_i}$ is total and $h(e) \notin \mathcal{F}[\text{FIN}]$. On the other hand, if $e \in \text{COINF}$, then for all i $\lim_{x\to\infty} g(e,i,x)$ exists. In other words, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an x such that for all $y > x$, $g(e,i,y) = g(e,i,x)$. We conclude that $\{h(e)\}^{F_i}$ is finite for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h(e) \in \mathcal{F}[\text{FIN}]$. Thus, h witnesses the desired result: $\mathcal{F}[\text{FIN}]$ is Π^0_3-hard.

□

Note that while an oracle drawn from a uniformly computable family does not confer additional computational power it does affect the output of an oracle program.

Theorem 2.4. *$\Delta^0_2[\text{FIN}]$ is Π^0_4-complete and contains a strongly non-trivial element.*

Proof. First, we prove that $\Delta^0_2[\text{FIN}]$ is Π^0_4. To this end, we say that $d \in \omega$ is a Δ^0_2 *code* if $\{d\}$ is a total function and, for each $x \in \omega$

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \{d\}(\langle s, x\rangle)$$

exists, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is a fixed computable pairing function. Note that the predicate "d is a Δ^0_2 code" is Π^0_3. Supposing that d is a Δ^0_2 code, define the functions d_t, for $t \in \omega$, by

$$d_t(x) = \{d\}(\langle t, x\rangle)$$

and d_* by

$$d_*(x) = \lim_{t\to\infty} d_t(x).$$

Define predicates Γ and Σ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(e,d,x) &\iff (\forall k)(\exists t)(\text{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)) \geq k)\\ &\iff \{\text{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)) : t \in \omega\} \text{ is unbounded.}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Sigma(e,d,x) \iff (\forall s)(\exists t \geq s)(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)\uparrow).$$

It will follow that $e \in \Delta^0_2$ if, and only if,

$$(\forall d)\left(d \text{ is a } \Delta^0_2 \text{ code } \implies (\exists m)(\forall x \geq m)(\Gamma(e,d,x) \vee \Sigma(e,d,x))\right). \tag{1}$$

In particular, this will show that $\Delta^0_2[\text{FIN}]$ is Π^0_4.

Indeed, suppose that d is a Δ^0_2 code and $x \in \omega$. Suppose first that $\{e\}^{d_*}(x)$ converges. Let $k_0 = \text{use}(\{e\}^{d_*}(x))$ and let t_0 be large enough that, for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$d_t\restriction k_0 = d_*\restriction k_0.$$

It follows that, for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$\text{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)) \leq k_0$$

and, hence,

$$\{\text{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)) : t \in \omega\}$$

is bounded, i.e., $\neg\Gamma(e,d,x)$. Also, if s_0 is large enough that $\{e\}^{d_*}_{s_0}(x)$ has converged and $t \geq \max\{s_0, t_0\}$, then $\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)$ converges. Thus, $\neg\Sigma(e,d,x)$. As d and x were arbitrary, this establishes the "$\implies$" part of (1).

On the other hand, suppose that $x \in \omega$ and d is a Δ^0_2 code such that the computation $\{e\}^{d_*}(x)$ diverges. There are two cases. In the first place, suppose that $\mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_*}_t)$ is unbounded, as $t \to \infty$. Fix $k \in \omega$ and let s be such that

$$u = \mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_*}_s(x)) \geq k.$$

Let t_0 be such that, for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$d_t{\restriction}u = d_*{\restriction}u.$$

If $t = \max\{s, t_0\}$, then

$$\mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)) \geq \mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_s(x)) = \mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_*}_t(x)) \geq k.$$

As k was arbitrary, it follows that $\{\mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_t}_t : t \in \omega\}$ is unbounded, i.e., $\Gamma(e, d, x)$.

Secondly, suppose that $\{e\}^{d_*}(x)$ diverges, but the use of the computation is bounded, say

$$\mathrm{use}(\{e\}^{d_*}_t(x)) \leq u,$$

for all $t \in \omega$. Let t_0 be such that

$$d_t{\restriction}u = d_*{\restriction}u,$$

for all $t \geq t_0$. In particular, for each $t \geq t_0$, the computation $\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)$ is equivalent to the computation $\{e\}^{d_*}_t(x)$. Hence, $\{e\}^{d_t}_t(x)$ diverges for all $t \geq t_0$. Hence, $\Sigma(e, d, x)$ holds, since d and x were arbitrary.

Combining the two cases above establishes the "$\Longleftarrow$" part of (1).

Fix a Π^0_4 predicate, Q, and a computable function, g, such that

$$Q(e) \leftrightarrow (\forall x)(\exists y)\big[g(e, x, y) \in \textsc{inf}\big]$$

Define a computable function, h, such that

$$\{h(e)\}^A_s(n) = \begin{cases} \langle A{\restriction}n\rangle & \text{if } (\forall j \leq n)\big[\min(C_{j+1}(A)) < s \\ & \wedge \min(C_{j+1}(A)) > \max(W_{g(e,i,j),s})\big] \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where $i = \min(C_0(A))$ and $\{h(e)\}^A(n) \uparrow$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $C_0(A) = \emptyset$.

If $C_0(A) = \emptyset$, then $W_e = \emptyset$. If $Q(e)$ and $C_0(A) \neq \emptyset$, let $i = \min(C_0(A))$. Because $Q(e)$, there is a j such that $g(e, i, j) \in \textsc{inf}$. Hence, for all but finitely many s, either $\min(C_{j+1}(A)) \geq s$ or $\min(C_{j+1}(A)) < \max(W_{g(e,i,j),s})$ and W_e is finite. We conclude that $h(e) \in \Delta^2_0[\textsc{fin}]$.

Now suppose that $\neg Q(e)$ and let x be such that $(\forall y)[g(e, x, y) \in \textsc{fin}]$. Since the maximum of each $W_{g(e,x,y)}$ for $y \in \mathbb{N}$ can be found in the limit, there is a Δ^2_0 oracle, A, such that $C_j(A) \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\min(C_0(A)) = x$ and $\min(C_{j+1}(A)) > \max(W_{g(e,x,j)})$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $W^A_{h(e)}$ is infinite and $A \in \Delta^2_0$, $h(e) \notin \Delta^2_0[\textsc{fin}]$.

Thus, h reduces Q to $\Delta^2_0[\textsc{fin}]$.

□

Before stating the next proposition, we recall the following standard definitions.

Definition 2.5. A function, f, is said to be *diagonally non-computable* if $f(e) \neq \{e\}(e)$ whenever $\{e\}(e)\downarrow$. Let $\textsc{dnc} = \{f \in \omega^\omega : f \text{ is DNC}\}$.

A function, f, is n *diagonally non-computable (n-DNC)* if it is diagonally non-computable and, additionally, $f(e) \leq n$, for each e. Let $\textsc{dnc}_n = \{f \in \omega^\omega : f \text{ is } n\text{-DNC}\}$.

Theorem 2.6. $\text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$ *is* Π^0_2*-complete for all* $n \geq 2$.

Proof. $e \notin \text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$ if and only if

$$(\exists \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega})\Big(\sigma \text{ is a } \text{DNC}_n \text{ string} \wedge \{e\}^\sigma\restriction|\sigma| \text{ is not a } \text{DNC}_{n+1} \text{ string}\Big).$$

The statement "σ is a DNC_n string" is equivalent to

$$(\forall x < |\sigma|)\Big((\forall s)\big(\{x\}_s(x)\uparrow\big) \vee (\exists s)\big(\{x\}_s(x)\downarrow \neq \sigma(x) < n\big)\Big),$$

and the statement "$\{e\}^\sigma\restriction|\sigma|$ is not a DNC_{n+1} string" is equivalent to

$$(\exists x < |\sigma|)\Big((\forall s)\big(\{e\}^\sigma_s(x)\uparrow\big) \vee (\exists s, y)\big(\{e\}^\sigma_s(x)\downarrow = y \wedge (y = \{x\}_s(x)\downarrow \vee y \geq n+1)\big)\Big).$$

Thus, "$e \notin \text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$" is Σ^0_2, i.e., $\text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$ is Π^0_2.

Define a computable function f such that $\{f(e)\}^\sigma\restriction|\sigma| = \sigma\restriction|W_{e,|\sigma|}|$. If $e \in \text{INF}$, then $\{f(e)\}^g = g$ for all $g \in \omega^\omega$. If $e \in \text{FIN}$, then the domain of $\{f(e)\}^g$ is finite for all $g \in \omega^\omega$. Since every DNC_n is also DNC_{n+1}, $f(e) \in \text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$ if $e \in \text{INF}$ and not otherwise, showing that $\text{DNC}_n[\text{DNC}_{n+1}]$ is Π^0_2-hard.

□

3. Π^1_1-completeness

In what follows we give a general, but somewhat technical, theorem which implies that a number of natural index sets of the form $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$ are Π^1_1-complete.

Definition 3.1. Let c be a finite ordinal or ω. We say that a function $f : \omega^\omega \to c^\omega$ is a Δ^0_2 *embedding* if, and only if, there is a uniformly computable sequence, $f_s : \omega^{<\omega} \to c^{<\omega}$, of total recursive functions such that the following conditions hold:

(1) $f_s(\alpha) \prec f_s(\beta)$ if, and only if, $\alpha \prec \beta$, i.e., each f_s is a $\prec$*-isomorphism*
(2) $\lim_s f_s(\alpha)$ exists, for each $\alpha \in \omega^{<\omega}$
(3) $f(x) = \bigcup_n \lim_s f_s(x\restriction n)$

Note that the union $\bigcup_n \lim_s f_s(x\restriction n)$ is a well-defined function on ω since the f_s all preserve proper extension

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{A} \subset c^\omega$ *(where* c *is a finite ordinal or* ω*) and* $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^\omega$ *are hyperarithmetic, with* $\mathcal{B}$ *a tail set containing no finite sets and no cofinite sets, and there is a* Δ^0_2 *embedding* $f : \omega^\omega \to c^\omega$ *such that the range of* f *is relatively closed in* $\mathcal{A}$*. If there is a Medvedev reduction,* Φ*, of* $\mathcal{B}$ *to* $\mathcal{A}$*, then the set of* $\mathcal{A}$*-universal* $\mathcal{B}$*-codes is* Π^1_1*-complete.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, Φ and f be as above, with $f_s : \omega^{<\omega} \to c^{<\omega}$ witnessing that f is a Δ^0_2 embedding. For convenience, define $f_* : \omega^{<\omega} \to c^{<\omega}$ by $f_*(\alpha) = \lim_s f_s(\alpha)$ and observe that, by the properties of the f_s, the map f_* is also a $\prec$-isomorphism.

In the first place, it follows from the definition of $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$ and the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are both hyperarithmetic that $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$ is Π^1_1. To show that $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$ is Π^1_1-hard, it will suffice to reduce the Π^1_1-complete set NoPath (see Corollary IV.2.16 from [7]) to $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$, where NoPath is the set of codes for recursive trees with no infinite branches. More precisely, if $\rho_0, \rho_1, \ldots$ is a recursive enumeration of $\omega^{<\omega}$ and $e \in \omega$, with $\{e\}$ total, define T_e to be the tree generated by

$$\{\rho_i : \{e\}(i)\downarrow = 1\}.$$

Let

$$\textsc{NoPath} = \{e : \{e\} \text{ is total and } [T_e] = \emptyset\}.$$

With this in mind, we will define Turing functionals Φ_e such that Φ_e is a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, if, and only if, $e \in \textsc{NoPath}$. For each $e \in \omega$ and $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$, let

$$n_{e,\sigma} = \max\{\min\{s, |\beta|\} : (\exists \alpha \in T_{e,|\sigma|})(\beta \preceq f_s(\alpha) \wedge \sigma \succeq \beta\}$$

and

$$m_{e,\sigma} = \max\{m : (\forall i \leq m)(\{e\}_{|\sigma|}(\tau_i)\downarrow)\},$$

where $\tau_0, \tau_1, \ldots$ is a fixed recursive enumeration of $c^{<\omega}$. Finally, define

$$\Phi_e(\sigma) = (\Phi(\sigma) \cup [0, n_{e,\sigma}]) \cap [0, m_{e,\sigma}].$$

In the first place, if $\{e\}$ is not total, then $m_{e,\sigma}$ is bounded as σ varies over $\omega^{<\omega}$ and, hence, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi_e(X\restriction n)$ is a finite set (consequently, not in $\mathcal{B}$), for each $X \in \omega^\omega$. It follows that Φ_e is not a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$.

Therefore, assume that $\{e\}$ is total, i.e., $m_{e,\sigma} \to \infty$, as $|\sigma| \to \infty$.

Suppose first that $[T_e] \neq \emptyset$, with $X \in [T_e]$. The family $\mathcal{B}$ contains no cofinite sets (in particular, $\mathcal{B}$ does not contain ω) and, hence, to show that Φ_e is not a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, it will suffice to show that $\Phi_e(X) = \bigcup_n \Phi_e(X\restriction n) = \omega$. In turn, it will be enough to show that

$$\lim_{\substack{\sigma \prec X \\ |\sigma|\to\infty}} n_{e,\sigma} = \infty.$$

Indeed, fix $n_0 \in \omega$ and let $\sigma_0 \prec f(X)$ be long enough that there exists an $\alpha_0 \in T_{e,|\sigma_0|}$ with $|f_*(\alpha_0)| \geq n_0$. Next, let $s_0 \geq n_0$ be large enough that $f_s(\alpha) = f_*(\alpha)$, for each $s \geq s_0$ and $\alpha \preceq \alpha_0$. Letting $\beta = f_*(\alpha_0) = f_{s_0}(\alpha_0)$, it follows that

$$n_{e,\sigma} \geq \min\{s_0, \beta\} \geq n_0,$$

for every $\sigma \succeq \sigma_0$, by the definition of $n_{e,\sigma}$.

Next, assume that $[T_e] = \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is a tail set, to show that Φ_e is Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, it will suffice to show that, for each $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, the set $\{n_{e,\sigma} : \sigma \prec Y\}$ is bounded and, hence, $\Phi_e(Y)$ differs only finitely from $\Phi(Y)$, for each $Y \in \mathcal{A}$.

Indeed, fix $Y \in \mathcal{A}$. First, suppose that $Y = f(X)$, for some $X \in \omega^\omega$. Let $\alpha_0 \prec X$ be longest such that $\alpha_0 \in T_e$. Let s_0 be large enough that $f_s(\alpha) = f_*(\alpha)$, for each $s \geq s_0$ and $\alpha \preceq \alpha_0$. Fix $\sigma \prec Y = f(X)$, with $\sigma \succeq f_*(\alpha_0)$. Suppose that $s \geq s_0$, $\alpha \in T_e$ and $\beta \in c^{<\omega}$, with $\beta \preceq f_s(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \succeq \beta$. If $|\beta| > |f_*(\alpha_0)|$, then $f_s(\alpha) \succ f_*(\alpha_0) = f_s(\alpha_0)$. Hence, $\alpha \succ \alpha_0$, since f_s is a $\prec$-isomorphism. This is a contradiction, since no extension of α_0 is in T_e. It follows that $|\beta| \leq |f_*(\alpha_0)|$. Consequently, if $\alpha \in T_e$, $s \in \omega$ and $\beta, \sigma \in c^{<\omega}$ are such that $\beta \preceq f_s(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \succeq \beta$, then either $|\beta| \leq |f_*(\alpha_0)|$ or $s < s_0$. It follows that

$$n_{e,\sigma} \leq \max\{s_0 - 1, |f_*(\alpha_0)|\},$$

for any $\sigma \prec Y$.

Finally, assume that $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, but $Y \neq f(X)$, for every $X \in \omega^\omega$. Since the range of f is relatively closed in $\mathcal{A}$, choose $\sigma_0 \prec Y$ longest such that $\sigma_0 \prec f(X)$, for some $X \in \omega^\omega$. Let $\alpha_0 \in \omega^{<\omega}$ be such that $f_*(\alpha_0) \succeq \sigma_0$. Let s_0 be large enough that $f_s(\alpha) = f_*(\alpha)$, for all $s \geq s_0$ and $\alpha \preceq \alpha_0$. Fix $\sigma \prec Y$, with $|\sigma| \geq |\sigma_0|$. If s, β and α are such that $\beta \preceq f_s(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \succeq \beta$, then either $\beta \preceq \sigma_0$ or $s < s_0$. Thus,

$$n_{e,\sigma} \leq \max\{s_0 - 1, |\sigma_0|\}$$

and it follows that

$$\{n_{e,\sigma} : \sigma \prec Y\}$$

is bounded. This completes the proof. □

Definition 3.3. We define several forms of immunity and associated index sets.

(1) A is *immune* if A is infinite and contains no infinite c.e. set.
(2) A is *bi-immune* if A and $\overline{A}$ are both immune.
(3) IM $= \{A \subset \mathbb{N} : A \text{ is immune}\}$.
(4) BI $= \{A \subset \mathbb{N} : A \text{ is bi-immune}\}$.

Corollary 3.4. *The index sets* DNC[IM] *and* DNC[BI] *are both* Π^1_1*-complete.*

See Definition 2.5 for the definition of DNC.

Proof. An examination of the relevant definitions reveals that the sets DNC, IM and BI satisfy the required topological and definability properties to apply Theorem 3.2. Since there are known to be Medvedev reductions of IM and BI to DNC, it will suffice to define a function $f : \omega^\omega \to \omega^\omega$ which is a Δ^0_2 embedding into DNC.

Let $\langle\cdot\rangle : \omega^{<\omega} \to \omega$ be a recursive coding of finite strings. For each $\alpha \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and $n < |\alpha|$, define

$$f_s(\alpha)(n) = \begin{cases} 2\langle \alpha\restriction n\rangle & \text{if } \{n\}_s(n) \neq 2\langle\alpha\restriction n\rangle \\ 1 + 2\langle\alpha\restriction n\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Note that $f_s(\alpha)$ is a string of integers of length $|\alpha|$ and, moreover, that each f_s is a $\prec$-isomorphism. For $X \in \omega^\omega$, let $f(X)$ be as in the definition of a Δ^0_2 embedding, i.e.,

$$f(X) = \bigcup_n \lim_{s\to\infty} f(X\restriction n).$$

First of all, note that the range of f is the closed subset of ω^ω, consisting of those X such that, for each $n \in \omega$,

$$X(n) = \begin{cases} 2\langle X\restriction n\rangle & \text{if } \{n\}(n)\downarrow \neq 2\langle X\restriction n\rangle \\ 1 + 2\langle X\restriction n\rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, note that $f(X) \in$ DNC, for each $X \in \omega^\omega$. We may now apply Theorem 3.2 to conclude that DNC[BI] is Π^1_1-complete. □

With a couple more definitions, we will be able to state another corollary of Theorem 3.2

Definition 3.5. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{fin}}(\omega)$ denote the family of finite subsets of ω. A *canonical numbering* is a total computable function $H : \omega \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{fin}}(\omega)$ such that

(1) each finite set is in the range of H,
(2) the predicate "$x \in H(e)$" is computable, and
(3) the function $e \mapsto \max H(e)$ is computable.

Identifying $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{fin}}(\omega)$ with $2^{<\omega}$, we could alternatively characterize a canonical numbering as a total computable function $H : \omega \to 2^{<\omega}$ such that each finite set is in the range of H.

Definition 3.6. [1] A infinite set $R \subseteq \omega$ is *canonically immune* if, and only if, there is a total computable function h such that, for each canonical numbering H, and all but finitely many $e \in \omega$,

$$H(e) \subseteq R \implies |H(e)| \leq h(e).$$

Definition 3.7. [4] A function $f : \omega \to \omega$ is *strongly non-recursive* if, and only if, for each total computable function $h : \omega \to \omega$, one has $f(n) \neq h(n)$, for all but finitely many n.

Corollary 3.8. *The index set* CI[SNR] *is* Π^1_1*-complete.*

Proof. In what follows, we freely identify an element of 2^ω or $2^{<\omega}$ with the subset of ω of which it is the characteristic function.

In the first place, an inspection of the proof Theorem 5.5 in [1] reveals that there is a Medvedev reduction of SNR to CI. It follows from the definitions of CI and SNR that the requisite topological and definability properties are satisfied in order to apply Theorem 3.2. All that remains is to define a Δ^0_2 embedding into CI with a relatively closed range.

To this end, we begin by defining a universal function for canonical numberings. Let $\varphi : \omega^2 \to 2^{<\omega}$ be a universal partial recursive function. Define

$$D_{r,s}(e) = \begin{cases} \varphi(r,e) & \text{if } \varphi(r,e) \text{ converges within } s \text{ stages,} \\ \langle\emptyset\rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $D_r(e) = \lim_{s\to\infty} D_{r,s}(e)$. It follows that each canonical numbering appears as D_r, for some r, though not every D_r is a canonical numbering. The function D is itself limit computable.

Define

$$F_n = \bigcup_{r,e\leq n} D_r(e)$$

and note the sequence, F_n, of finite sets is uniformly limit computable. Since every finite set is contained in some F_n, it follows that there exist $n_0 < n_1 < \ldots$ and $x_0 < x_1 < \ldots$ such that, for each i,

$$F_{n_i} \setminus F_{n_i-1} \neq \emptyset$$

and

$$x_i \in F_{n_i} \setminus F_{n_i-1}.$$

The sequence, $(x_i)_{i\in\omega}$, may be chosen to be strictly increasing and limit computable. We may, therefore, take a computable sequence, $(x_{i,s})_{i,s\in\omega}$ such that, for each i,

$$x_i = \lim_{s\to\infty} x_{i,s}$$

and, for fixed s, the $x_{i,s}$ are all distinct.

For each $s \in \omega$ and $\alpha \in \omega^{<\omega}$, define $f_s(\alpha) \in 2^{<\omega}$ to have length

$$x_{(\alpha(0)+\ldots+\alpha(|\alpha|-1)+|\alpha|-1),s} + 1$$

and be such that

$$f_s(\alpha)(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\exists i, p \in \omega)(p < |\alpha| \wedge j = x_{i,s} \wedge i = \alpha(0) + \ldots + \alpha(p) + p), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that each f_s is a $\prec$-isomorphism. Let $f : \omega^\omega \to$ CI be as in the definition of a Δ^0_2 embedding.

It remains to verify that each $f(X)$ is canonically immune. Indeed, suppose that $H : \omega \to 2^{<\omega}$ is a canonical numbering, with $H = D_r$. For each $e \geq r$ observe that $D_r(e) \subseteq F_e$ and, hence, for any $X \in \omega^\omega$,

$$f(X) \cap D_r(e) \subseteq \{x_0, \ldots, x_e\}.$$

In particular, $|f(X) \cap D_r(e)| \leq e+1$. As H was arbitrary, it follows that each $f(X)$ is canonically immune, witnessed by the computable function $h(e) = e + 1$.

Finally, to see that the range of f is relatively closed, simply observe that the range of f is the intersection of CI with the closed set

$$\{Y \in 2^\omega : (\forall j)(Y(j) \neq 0 \implies (\exists i)(j = x_i))\}.$$

This completes the proof. □

In Theorem 3.2, we required that the Δ^0_2 embedding have relatively closed range in the class $\mathcal{A}$. In fact, we can achieve the same result if we require that the map, f, have relatively Π^0_2 range in $\mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq c^\omega$ (where c is a finite ordinal or ω) and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^\omega$ are hyperarithmetic, with $\mathcal{B}$ a tail set containing no finite sets and no cofinite sets, and there is a Δ^0_2 embedding $f : \omega^\omega \to c^\omega$ such that the range of f is the intersection of a Π^0_2 class, P, with $\mathcal{A}$. If there is a Medvedev reduction, Φ, of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, then the set of $\mathcal{A}$-universal $\mathcal{B}$-codes is Π^1_1-complete.*

Note that this result is neither a generalization of Theorem 3.2 nor *vice versa*, since not every closed set is a Π^0_2 class and not every Π^0_2 class is closed. Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 3.9, we recall the definition of a Π^0_2 class.

Definition 3.10. Let c be a finite ordinal or ω. A class, $P \subseteq c^\omega$, is a Π^0_2 *class* if, and only if, there is a total computable function $h : \omega^2 \to c^{<\omega}$ such that, for each $X \in c^\omega$,

$$X \in P \iff (\forall n)(\exists s)(h(n, s) \prec X).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, f, P and Φ be as in the statement of Theorem 3.9. Let f_s be as in the definition of a Δ^0_2 embedding, witnessing that f is such an embedding. Again, let f_* be the pointwise limit of the sequence $(f_s)_{s\in\omega}$. Finally, let $h : \omega^2 \to c^{<\omega}$ be a total recursive function, as in Definition 3.10, witnessing that P is a Π^0_2 class. For convenience, we write

$$U_{n,s} = \{\sigma \in c^{<\omega} : (\exists t \leq s)(h(n, t) \preceq \sigma)\}.$$

Each $U_{n,s}$ is, by definition, closed under extension. With this notation, for each $X \in c^\omega$,

$$X \in P \iff (\forall n)(\exists s)(\text{an initial segment of } X \text{ is in } U_{n,s}).$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we reduce the Π^1_1-complete set NoPath to $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{B}]$. With respect to the coding of recursive trees, we adopt notation from the proof of Theorem 3.2.

What follows is similar in character to the proof of Theorem 3.2, with the addition of some refinements to accomodate the fact that the range of f may not be closed. Given $e \in \omega$ and $\sigma \in c^{<\omega}$, let

$$n_{e,\sigma} = \max\{\min\{s, |\beta|, n\} : (\exists \alpha \in T_{e,|\sigma|})(\beta \preceq f_s(\alpha) \wedge \sigma \succeq \beta \wedge (\forall k \leq n)(\beta \in U_{k,|\sigma|}))\}.$$

As before, let

$$m_{e,\sigma} = \max\{m : (\forall i \leq m)(\{e\}_{|\sigma|}(\tau_i)\downarrow\},$$

where $\tau_0, \tau_1, \ldots$ is a fixed recursive enumeration of $c^{<\omega}$. Define

$$\Phi_e(\sigma) = (\Phi(\sigma) \cup [0, n_{e,\sigma}]) \cap [0, m_{e,\sigma}].$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, if $\{e\}$ is not total, then $m_{e,\sigma}$ is bounded as σ varies over $c^{<\omega}$ and, consequently, $\Phi_e(Y)$ is the characteristic function of a finite set, for every $Y \in c^\omega$. Thus, Φ_e is not a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, since $\mathcal{B}$ contains no finite sets.

Therefore, suppose that $\{e\}$ is total and T_e, the recursive tree coded by e, has an infinite branch, $X \in [T_e]$. To show that Φ_e is not a Medvedev reduction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, it will suffice to show that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} n_{e,X\restriction k} = \infty$$

as Φ_e will then be the characteristic function of ω. Indeed, fix $n_0 \in \omega$. Let $\sigma_0 \prec f(X)$, with $|\sigma_0|$ such that

- $|\sigma_0| \geq n_0$ and
- $\sigma_0 \in U_{n_0,|\sigma_0|}$.

Now choose σ_1 such that

- $\sigma_0 \preceq \sigma_1 \prec f(X)$ and
- there exists $\alpha_0 \in T_{e,|\sigma_1|}$ such that $\sigma_0 \prec f_*(\alpha_0) \prec f(X)$.

Finally, let s_0 be such that

- $s_0 \geq n_0$ and
- $f_{s_0}(\alpha_0) = f_*(\alpha_0)$.

It follows from the definition of $n_{e,\sigma}$ that, for each $\sigma \succeq \sigma_1$

$$n_{e,\sigma} \geq \min\{s_0, f_*(\alpha_0), n_0\} \geq n_0.$$

Suppose now that $[T_e] = \emptyset$. We must show that $\Phi(Y) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \Phi(Y\restriction j) \in \mathcal{B}$, for each $Y \in \mathcal{A}$. In the first place, suppose that $Y \in \mathrm{range}(f)$, say with $Y = f(X)$. To show that $\Phi(Y) \in \mathcal{B}$, it will suffice to show that

$$\{n_{e,\sigma} : \sigma \prec f(X)\}$$

is bounded. Let α_0 be longest with $\alpha_0 \in T_e$ and let s_0 be such that, for each $s \geq s_0$ and $\alpha \preceq \alpha_0$, we have $f_s(\alpha) = f_*(\alpha)$. Suppose now that $\sigma \prec f(X)$, with $f_*(\alpha_0) \prec \sigma$, and s, β are such that there exists $\alpha \in T_e$, with $f_*(\alpha_0) \prec \beta \preceq f_s(\alpha)$ and $\beta \preceq \sigma$. If $s \geq s_0$, we have $\alpha_0 \prec \alpha$, since $f_s(\alpha_0) = f_*(\alpha_0)$ and f_s is a $\prec$-isomorphism. Hence, if $\sigma \prec f(X)$ and s, β are such that there exists $\alpha \in T_e$ with $\beta \prec f_s(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \succeq \beta$, then either $s < s_0$ or $|\beta| \leq f_*(\alpha_0)$. It follows that

$$n_{e,\sigma} \leq \min\{s_0 - 1, |f_*(\alpha_0)|\}$$

for $\sigma \prec f(X)$.

Finally, suppose that $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, but $Y \notin \mathrm{range}(f)$. Again, we will see that

$$\{n_{e,\sigma} : \sigma \prec f(X)\}$$

is bounded. Since $Y \notin \mathrm{range}(f)$, let n_0 be such that, for every $n > n_0$, no initial segment of Y lies in $\bigcup_t U_{n,t}$. It follows from the definition of $n_{e,\sigma}$ that, for any $\sigma \prec Y$, we have $n_{e,\sigma} \leq n_0$. □

We conclude with a corollary of this result. Recall from [2] that $\text{DNC} <_s \text{DNC}_n$. Hence, there are Medvedev reductions of IM and BI to DNC_n, for each $n \in \omega$. (See Definition 2.5 for the definition of DNC_n.)

Corollary 3.11. *The index sets* $\text{DNC}_n[\text{IM}]$ *and* $\text{DNC}_n[\text{BI}]$ *are both* Π^1_1*-complete.*

Proof. In light of Theorem 3.9, it will suffice to produce a Δ^0_2 embedding, f, of ω^ω into DNC_n, such that the range of f the intersection of DNC_n with a Π^0_2 class. Note that such an embedding cannot have a closed range, otherwise it would be a homeomorphism between ω^ω and a compact space.

Let $\varphi : \omega^2 \to n$ be a universal partial recursive function and, for each $s \in \omega$, let $x_{0,s} < x_{1,s} < \ldots$ enumerate those x such that $\varphi_x(x)$ has not yet converged in s stages. Each sequence $(x_{i,s})_{s\in\omega}$ is eventually constant, say with limit x_i. Observe that $x_0 < x_1 < \ldots$ enumerate those x such that $\varphi_x(x)$ diverges.

Fix a DNC_n function, H. For each $s \in \omega$ and $\alpha \in \omega^{<\omega}$, define $f_s(\alpha) \in n^{<\omega}$ of length

$$x_{(\alpha(0)+\ldots+\alpha(|\alpha|-1)+|\alpha|-1),s} + 1$$

such that

$$f_s(\alpha)(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\exists i, p)(j = x_{i,s} \wedge i = \alpha(0) + \ldots + \alpha(p) + p), \\ 0 & \text{if } (\exists i)(j = x_{i,s}), \text{ but there is no } p \text{ as above}, \\ H(j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $f : \omega^\omega \to \text{DNC}_n$ be the Δ^0_2 embedding induced by the f_s. It follows that, for each $Y \in \omega^\omega$ and each $j \in \omega$

$$f(Y)(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\exists i, p)(j = x_i \wedge i = Y(0) + \ldots + Y(p) + p), \\ 0 & \text{if } (\exists i)(j = x_i), \text{ but there is no } p \text{ as above}, \\ H(j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that, if $G \in \text{DNC}_n$, then $G(x) = H(x)$, for each $x \notin \{x_0, x_1, \ldots\}$. Hence,

$$\text{range}(f) = \text{DNC}_n \cap \{Y \in n^\omega : (\forall i)(Y(x_i) \in \{0, 1\}) \wedge (\exists^\infty i)(Y(x_i) = 1)\}.$$

Observe that, since the sequence $(x_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is limit computable, it follows that the latter set in the intersection above is Π^0_2. In other words, range(f) is the intersection of DNC_n with a Π^0_2 class. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Achilles Beros, Mushfeq Khan, and Bjørn Kjos-Hanssen. Effective bi-immunity and randomness. *To appear in the proceedings of* Computability and Complexity Symposium, 2017.

[2] Carl G. Jockusch. Degrees of functions with no fixed points. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, 126:191–201, 1989.

[3] Carl G. Jockusch and Andrew E. M. Lewis. Diagonally non-computable functions and bi-immunity. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 78(03):977–988, 2013.

[4] Bjørn Kjos-Hanssen, Wolfgang Merkle, and Frank Stephan. Kolmogorov complexity and the recursion theorem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(10):5465–5480, 2011.

[5] Yuri T. Medvedev. Degrees of difficulty of mass problems. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, ns*, volume 104, pages 501–504, 1955.

[6] A. A. Muchnik. On strong and weak reducibility of algorithmic problems. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 4(6), 1963.

[7] Piergiorgio Odifreddi. *Classical recursion theory: The theory of functions and sets of natural numbers*. Elsevier, 1992.